

# **EXHIBIT 19**

# **MiniScript**

of the deposition of

**Natalie Nelson-Ling**

(Volume I)

Taken October 21, 2016

in the matter

**United States of America; the States of California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington and Wisconsin; the District of Columbia, the City of Chicago and ex rel. Oswald Bilotta,**

v

**Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation**

Case Number: 11 CIV 0071 (PGG)



Offices in Manhattan, Washington, D.C., Atlanta, New Orleans,  
Chicago, San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, Seattle  
Depositions Covered All Points In Between!

888.lipka.com  
866.lipka.fax  
transcripts@lipka.com  
www.lipka.com

**Natalie Nelson-Ling****10/21/2016****Volume I**

<p>1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK  3 -----X  4 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, the States  5 of CALIFORNIA, COLORADO, CONNECTICUT,  6 DELAWARE, FLORIDA, GEORGIA, HAWAII,  7 ILLINOIS, INDIANA, IOWA, LOUISIANA, Case Number  8 MASSACHUSETTS, MICHIGAN, MINNESOTA, 11 Civ. 0071 (PGG)  9 MONTANA, NEVADA, NEW HAMPSHIRE,  10 NEW JERSEY, NEW MEXICO, NEW YORK,  11 NORTH CAROLINA, OKLAHOMA, RHODE ISLAND,  12 TENNESSEE, TEXAS, VIRGINIA, WASHINGTON  13 and WISCONSIN; the DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,  14 the CITY OF CHICAGO and ex rel. OSWALD  15 BILOTTA,  16 Plaintiffs and Relator,  17 -against-  18 NOVARTIS PHARMACEUTICALS CORPORATION,  19 Defendant.  20 -----X  21 October 21, 2016, 10:09 am  22 Deposition of NATALIE ELAINE NELSON-LING  23 lipka.com, inc.  24 888.lipka.com  25 transcripts@lipka.com</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 A P P E A R A N C E S (Continued):  2  3 SHEPHERD FINKELMAN MILLER &amp; SHAH, LLP.  4 Attorneys for Relator, Oswald Bilotta  5 65 Main Street  6 Chester, Connecticut 06412  7 BY: LAURIE RUBINOW, ESQ.  8  9  10 ALSO PRESENT:  11 SARA M. ZAUSMER, Director,  12 Novartis Services, Inc.  13 ROBERT CALVERT, The Videographer  14 NICK LUSSIER, Paralegal,  15 Shepherd Finkelman Miller &amp; Shah, LLP.  16  17  18  19  20  21  22  23  24  25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 3</p>
<p>1 A P P E A R A N C E S:  2  3 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  4 U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE  5 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK  6 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  7 86 Chambers Street  8 New York, New York 10007  9 BY: JENNIFER JUDE, ESQ.  10  11 CRAVATH SWAINE &amp; MOORE, LLP.  12 Attorneys for Defendant  13 Worldwide Plaza  14 825 Eighth Avenue  15 New York, New York 10019-4775  16 BY: BENJAMIN GRUENSTEIN, ESQ.  17 AND: OLIVER ROCOS, ESQ.  18  19 SKADDEN ARPS SLATE MEAGHER &amp; FLOM, LLP.  20 Attorneys for The Witness  21 4 Times Square  22 New York, New York 10036  23 BY: STEVEN R. GLASER, ESQ.  24 AND: YOOSUN KOH, ESQ.  25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 2</p>	<p>1 INDEX  2 Witness: Natalie Elaine Nelson-Ling Page  3 By: Ms. Jude 8  4 By: Mr. Gruenstein 242  5 By: Ms. Jude 264  6  7 E X H I B I T S  8 Nelson-Ling Exhibit Page  9 GX-1 Natasha Nelson's LinkedIn 43  10 Profile  11 GX-2 Document Bates stamped 145  12 NPCLSV_LIT003486097 through  13 NPCLSV_LIT003486142  14 GX-3 Slide presentation entitled 181  15 "2008 Audit of Sales  16 Representatives Interactions  17 With Healthcare Professionals"  18 Bates stamped  19 NPCLSV_LIT0001591473 through  20 NPCLSV_LIT001490)  21 GX-4 Document Bates stamped 204  22 NPCLSV_LIT66834049 through  23 NPCLSV_LIT66834054  24  25 (CONTINUED)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 4</p>

## Natalie Nelson-Ling

10/21/2016

Volume I

<p>1 to keep track of its speaker bureau, where the 2 money was being spent, what was being done, for 3 many reasons; ranging from, it was their money 4 and, you know, it was fiscally responsible. 5 They wanted to make certain that the company was 6 ethically responsible. 7 They wanted the speaker bureau to 8 be effective. You know, all the kinds of 9 information that Cindy was in charge of 10 collecting, all went to a corporate goal of 11 spending the money right, doing the right thing, 12 getting information out to doctors, so that they 13 could know how to treat their patients with 14 Novartis drugs, and so that doctors could 15 understand, also, the medical side of the 16 disease that the Novartis drugs treated. And 17 so, a very important component was the medical 18 education. 19 <b>Q. Within Novartis, were there other</b> 20 <b>departments or bodies, besides the ethics and</b> 21 <b>compliance department, that had a responsibility</b> 22 <b>for making sure that Novartis's promotional</b> 23 <b>events complied with the law?</b> 24 A. If I understand what you're asking, 25 everyone at Novartis was responsible for making</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p>	<p>1 <b>Q. Does that mean healthcare</b> 2 <b>providers?</b> 3 A. It does. 4 <b>Q. What do you understand a roundtable</b> 5 <b>to be?</b> 6 A. A roundtable is, as I understand 7 it, when the doctors are -- are sitting around a 8 table, as opposed to somebody standing up and 9 presenting, and I think it's -- it's less 10 formal. 11 <b>Q. Does it have the other</b> 12 <b>characteristics of the speaker program?</b> 13 A. It could. I was not involved in 14 auditing, monitoring or doing investigations, 15 that I recall, where I got into the detailed 16 aspects of what a roundtable was. 17 <b>Q. While you were at Novartis, did</b> 18 <b>someone else have responsibility for</b> 19 <b>investigations, auditing and monitoring of</b> 20 <b>roundtables?</b> 21 A. No. It would have been me. 22 <b>Q. So if you weren't doing it, then no</b> 23 <b>one was doing it?</b> 24 A. Investigations, I do not recall me 25 having a case regarding an investigation of a</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 39</p>
<p>1 certain that -- that they complied with the law. 2 So I can't name you individual departments. 3 <b>Q. Were there other departments,</b> 4 <b>besides ethics and compliance, that had that as</b> 5 <b>their primary role?</b> 6 A. The law department would have. And 7 there were probably other departments that I -- 8 I can't think of right now. 9 <b>Q. And just to make sure we're on the</b> 10 <b>same page. Could you define what you understand</b> 11 <b>a speaker program to be?</b> 12 A. A speaker program is a promotional 13 program in which a physician -- in which a 14 healthcare provider, be it a physician, a nurse 15 practitioner, a pharmacist, has been carefully 16 trained and hired to present the promotional 17 review committee approved deck, and, based upon 18 their training, provide clinical information and 19 be able to answer pertinent questions. 20 <b>Q. You said provide clinical</b> 21 <b>information and be able to answer pertinent</b> 22 <b>questions. Is there a particular audience part</b> 23 <b>of the definition of speaker program?</b> 24 A. The audience would be to other 25 HCPs.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 38</p>	<p>1 roundtable. We audited speaker programs 2 randomly, and I don't remember any of us going, 3 randomly picking something that turned out to be 4 a roundtable, and I'm not the best one to ask on 5 whether we ever did an audit about a roundtable, 6 because I just don't remember any more. 7 <b>Q. Who would be the best one to ask</b> 8 <b>about that?</b> 9 A. It would probably be David 10 Hollasch. 11 <b>Q. So sitting here today, you don't</b> 12 <b>remember doing any investigations, any auditing</b> 13 <b>or any monitoring while at Novartis that was</b> 14 <b>focused on a roundtable event?</b> 15 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Objection, lacks 16 foundation. Assumes there were roundtable 17 events during this period. 18 A. I must have, but I cannot recall. 19 <b>Q. Okay. So that's a -- let me repeat</b> 20 <b>my question.</b> 21 <b>So sitting here today, you don't</b> 22 <b>recall doing any investigations, auditing or</b> 23 <b>monitoring of roundtable events?</b> 24 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Same objection. 25 A. I don't recall right now. If you</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 40</p>

## Natalie Nelson-Ling

10/21/2016

Volume I

<p>1 experience working at Daiichi Sankyo.</p> <p>2 <b>Q. Is there anything in particular</b></p> <p>3 <b>about your experience working at Daiichi Sankyo</b></p> <p>4 <b>that led you to add speaker programs to Novartis</b></p> <p>5 <b>as a risk assessment list?</b></p> <p>6 A. I would say that the CIA that</p> <p>7 Daiichi Sankyo signed in January of 2015</p> <p>8 reflected many of the issues that we had been</p> <p>9 seeing at Daiichi Sankyo, which left me without</p> <p>10 any specific knowledge or hints even within the</p> <p>11 industry to put that at the top of my list.</p> <p>12 <b>Q. Could you describe in general terms</b></p> <p>13 <b>what those issues were?</b></p> <p>14 A. The issues at Daiichi Sankyo?</p> <p>15 <b>Q. Yes.</b></p> <p>16 A. The issues at Daiichi Sankyo</p> <p>17 concerned meal costs, promotional decks,</p> <p>18 locations, those kinds of areas. And so, when I</p> <p>19 went to Novartis, without having any specific</p> <p>20 knowledge of Novartis, we simply added in that</p> <p>21 we would do -- randomly attend 45 speaker</p> <p>22 programs within, basically, the period of Q3</p> <p>23 20 -- no, 2008.</p> <p>24 <b>Q. Was that the audit that was later</b></p> <p>25 <b>called the 2008 audit of interactions with HCPs?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p>	<p>1 me within 24 hours; so that, within a very short</p> <p>2 time frame, I could be able to call people and</p> <p>3 start doing the investigation.</p> <p>4 <b>Q. That person who was in charge of</b></p> <p>5 <b>investigations when you arrived, that you just</b></p> <p>6 <b>referred to, was that Maria Woods?</b></p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 <b>Q. Can you describe what you mean by,</b></p> <p>9 <b>she was very behind?</b></p> <p>10 A. When I came to Novartis, they</p> <p>11 didn't have a good system for counting and</p> <p>12 tracking complaints, and Maria's office was</p> <p>13 filled with file folders. So we took those file</p> <p>14 folders, and one by one went through, and, to</p> <p>15 the extent we could investigate them, we did.</p> <p>16 If we had to close them out because the</p> <p>17 employees were no longer there, we did; but we</p> <p>18 went through all the file folders that we found.</p> <p>19 <b>Q. Approximately how many</b></p> <p>20 <b>investigations was Ms. Woods handling at the</b></p> <p>21 <b>time that you arrived?</b></p> <p>22 A. I don't know how many she was</p> <p>23 handling. I know that there were hundreds of</p> <p>24 file folders.</p> <p>25 <b>Q. Does each of those file folders</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 51</p>
<p>1 A. I believe so.</p> <p>2 <b>Q. Let's look back at GX-1. Do you</b></p> <p>3 <b>see where it says, "Revised and strengthened the</b></p> <p>4 <b>compliance investigations systems and</b></p> <p>5 <b>protocols"?</b></p> <p>6 A. No.</p> <p>7 <b>Q. On the second line.</b></p> <p>8 A. Oh. Okay. Mid-sentence?</p> <p>9 <b>Q. Yes.</b></p> <p>10 A. "Revised and strengthened the</p> <p>11 compliance investigations systems and</p> <p>12 protocols." Yes, I see it.</p> <p>13 <b>Q. Could you describe what</b></p> <p>14 <b>specifically you did for Novartis?</b></p> <p>15 A. When I arrived at Novartis, they</p> <p>16 had a person in the compliance department that</p> <p>17 was doing investigations. She was very behind</p> <p>18 in her investigations, and I revised how we</p> <p>19 would do investigations, the priorities for</p> <p>20 addressing them, the time lines for handling</p> <p>21 them, and I made it my -- my job to teach people</p> <p>22 that received a complaint from someone to say</p> <p>23 things like, thank you for bringing this to our</p> <p>24 attention, I'm going to refer it to compliance,</p> <p>25 and I taught people to refer the complaints to</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 50</p>	<p>1 <b>relate to an individual investigation or more</b></p> <p>2 <b>than one investigation?</b></p> <p>3 A. Generally, one investigation.</p> <p>4 Maybe two. But, generally one.</p> <p>5 <b>Q. Was Ms. Woods the only employee at</b></p> <p>6 <b>Novartis who had a responsibility for doing</b></p> <p>7 <b>investigations at the time that you arrived?</b></p> <p>8 A. I don't think she was the only</p> <p>9 employee in charge of doing investigations. She</p> <p>10 was the only employee that worked for Julie Kane</p> <p>11 that was doing investigations.</p> <p>12 <b>Q. So she had a backlog of several</b></p> <p>13 <b>hundred investigations, is that correct?</b></p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 <b>Q. And, what ended up happening to all</b></p> <p>16 <b>of those investigations?</b></p> <p>17 A. We opened them, read them,</p> <p>18 investigated them, and either closed them out</p> <p>19 because the people were gone. Investigated</p> <p>20 them. They were either substantiated, not</p> <p>21 substantiated, unable to substantiate, but, we</p> <p>22 resolved every single one of them.</p> <p>23 <b>Q. Approximately what portion of them</b></p> <p>24 <b>were mooted by the fact that the employee was</b></p> <p>25 <b>gone?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 52</p>

## Natalie Nelson-Ling

10/21/2016

Volume I

<p>1 rewrite this differently. So we talked to him 2 about how you might write this, or things that 3 you might add to it.</p> <p>4 <b>Q. Were you attempting to reduce 5 ambiguity on the policies?</b></p> <p>6 A. In my view, I was.</p> <p>7 <b>Q. Did you find the policies that 8 Marty had written to be ambiguous?</b></p> <p>9 A. I found the policies that Marty had 10 written were understood better by non-lawyers 11 than lawyers, and understood better by some 12 people than others. I found that it was a mixed 13 bag.</p> <p>14 <b>Q. Did they -- strike that. Did the 15 policies that Marty had written related to 16 healthcare compliance leave room for 17 interpretation?</b></p> <p>18 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Objection; 19 leading.</p> <p>20 A. Yes. He viewed policies like a 21 constitution. I viewed -- I viewed policies 22 like a set of rules that you have for your kids. 23 You know, you brush your teeth, you do this. 24 And my understanding of rules are that it's 25 specific like that. Wake up in the morning and</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p>	<p>1 and eventually went over Marty's head to Julie 2 Kane to effect different training and 3 definitions on policies.</p> <p>4 <b>Q. Why did you have to go above 5 Marty's head to Julie Kane to do that?</b></p> <p>6 A. Because Marty and I -- Marty had a 7 different philosophy than I did, that's all it 8 was. It was a philosophical difference. And 9 Julie Kane was our supervisor. And, if I 10 couldn't reach agreement with Marty, then Marty 11 and I went together to Julie, and eventually we 12 created training that defined items that I felt 13 had not been as clear before, because of the 14 difference in philosophy on how to write a 15 policy.</p> <p>16 <b>Q. What did you observe during that Q3 17 audit that led you to your belief that others 18 had difficulty understanding the policies?</b></p> <p>19 A. That is a question that has many, 20 many parts to it, so let me try to parse it out. 21 In the Q3 audit, we did 42 ride-alongs and 22 attended, randomly, 45 different speaker 23 programs. The things that we saw were -- on 24 speaker programs, let's start there. 25 People didn't understand how to run</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p>
<p>1 brush your teeth, make up your bed, be dressed 2 in clothes that match. You know, specifics, 3 right?</p> <p>4 Marty -- Marty -- Marty felt that 5 the rule would be, wake up in the morning, get 6 ready and come down. And it's just two 7 different philosophies. It's not that his 8 philosophy was bad or my philosophy was bad. 9 It's just that we had different philosophies on 10 how to get to the same place of getting the kid 11 downstairs.</p> <p>12 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Maybe you have 13 different types of children.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: Yeah, we probably 15 did.</p> <p>16 <b>Q. Did you and David Hollasch advise 17 Mr. Putenis on policy changes because you felt 18 it would make the policies more effective?</b></p> <p>19 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Objection, 20 mischaracterizes the word advise.</p> <p>21 A. I felt, based upon what I saw 22 during the Q3 2008 audits, that other people 23 that worked for Novartis shared my view on 24 having a difficulty understanding the compliance 25 policy, and, based upon that, I talked to Marty,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p>	<p>1 a speaker program to reflect the financial 2 controls that Novartis management wanted. 3 People didn't think about some of the easy 4 controls, such as, count the number of heads, 5 compare it to how many meals you've been charged 6 for, a simple thing, but, in our audit we found 7 routinely the restaurants were sneaking in one, 8 two, three extra meals.</p> <p>9 If you haven't counted heads, if 10 you don't get the receipt at the end and count 11 the number of meals, it's easy to have -- to be 12 cheated.</p> <p>13 Of all the findings from our audit, 14 that was, I think, the one that upset management 15 the most, because they wanted a tight financial 16 control.</p> <p>17 For speaker programs, we found that 18 it wasn't clear that the speaker had to use the 19 promotional review committee approved deck 20 without changes; changes being adding, deleting, 21 modifying the deck. They didn't understand that 22 what the Novartis policy said was, have a room 23 conducive to a medical discussion. People 24 interpreted that as everything from a room with 25 four walls, to a unique table in the middle of a</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p>

## Natalie Nelson-Ling

10/21/2016

Volume I

<p>1 busy restaurant.</p> <p>2 And, because the policy was written</p> <p>3 as a constitution, each person was their own</p> <p>4 state, and each person had their own</p> <p>5 interpretation of how they were complying. So</p> <p>6 that's just examples on speaker programs.</p> <p>7 There's more speaker programs, but, let me move</p> <p>8 to ride-alongs and try to explain that.</p> <p>9 One of the things we were looking</p> <p>10 at in the ride-alongs was, did the training that</p> <p>11 was done, did it transfer and translate</p> <p>12 practically into reps knowing what to do. And</p> <p>13 so, we were checking things like, did the sales</p> <p>14 rep provide indication and limitations of use,</p> <p>15 safety; did they provide fair balance, advise of</p> <p>16 the black box warning on, for example, Diovan,</p> <p>17 did they have a full and fair promotional</p> <p>18 discussion with the physician, with the</p> <p>19 healthcare provider. We were looking at those</p> <p>20 kinds of things.</p> <p>21 And, basically, what David and I</p> <p>22 had done was that, we wanted to make certain</p> <p>23 that we were singing from the same hymnal. And</p> <p>24 so, before we did any of these ride-alongs or</p> <p>25 attended speaker programs, we came up with</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p>	<p>1 MS. JUDE: Yes. Absolutely.</p> <p>2 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This marks the</p> <p>3 end of tape number 1. We are going off the</p> <p>4 record. The time is 11:40.</p> <p>5 (Off the record)</p> <p>6 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Here marks the</p> <p>7 beginning of tape number 2. We are back on the</p> <p>8 record. The time is 11:56.</p> <p>9 <b>Q. Okay. So, Ms. Nelson-Ling, you</b></p> <p>10 <b>said earlier that one of the things that led you</b></p> <p>11 <b>to put speaker programs on your risk assessment</b></p> <p>12 <b>outline when you got to Novartis was your</b></p> <p>13 <b>experience at Daiichi Sankyo with respect to</b></p> <p>14 <b>meal costs, promotional decks and venues. Do</b></p> <p>15 <b>you remember saying that?</b></p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 <b>Q. So when you conducted that Q3 audit</b></p> <p>18 <b>while you were at Novartis, you found issues</b></p> <p>19 <b>with respect to those three things, is that</b></p> <p>20 <b>right?</b></p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 <b>Q. Okay. Was there anything else that</b></p> <p>23 <b>led you to put speaker programs on your risk</b></p> <p>24 <b>assessment outline, other than your experience</b></p> <p>25 <b>at Daiichi Sankyo, and also the trainings that</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p>
<p>1 checklists that we used, so that we always</p> <p>2 looked at exactly the same things, and during</p> <p>3 the ride-along checked it off. Did they say the</p> <p>4 indication? Check yes, check no.</p> <p>5 Did they say the limitations of</p> <p>6 use? Yes, no. Did they give a piece of ISI?</p> <p>7 Yes, no. Did they use a promotional detail</p> <p>8 piece? Yes. If so, what was it?</p> <p>9 Now, so that we were looking at</p> <p>10 exactly the same thing. So that, whether it was</p> <p>11 David going out or me going out, Rebecca going</p> <p>12 out, no matter who it was, we came up with the</p> <p>13 same answers, and so that gave us consolidated</p> <p>14 information.</p> <p>15 <b>Q. Before you did that Q3 audit with</b></p> <p>16 <b>those checklists, had Novartis done an audit of</b></p> <p>17 <b>speaker programs before?</b></p> <p>18 A. I do not know.</p> <p>19 <b>Q. You created those checklists for</b></p> <p>20 <b>the audit?</b></p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 <b>Q. So those checklists -- at least no</b></p> <p>23 <b>one used your checklist before you?</b></p> <p>24 A. Nobody used our checklist before.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: Could I take a break?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p>	<p>1 <b>you said that you did at food, drug and law</b></p> <p>2 <b>trainings, et cetera?</b></p> <p>3 A. Not that I recall specifically. It</p> <p>4 was really my experience and the training,</p> <p>5 trainings at FDLI, and also our outside counsel</p> <p>6 have these, you know, conferences every so</p> <p>7 often. A half day conference in New York City,</p> <p>8 and you go in and they train on important</p> <p>9 topics.</p> <p>10 <b>Q. So after the results for that --</b></p> <p>11 <b>from that -- let's start over again. After the</b></p> <p>12 <b>results from that Q3 audit came in, did you</b></p> <p>13 <b>continue to think that speaker programs belonged</b></p> <p>14 <b>on that risk assessment list?</b></p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 <b>Q. And why was that?</b></p> <p>17 A. We found issues that we needed to</p> <p>18 remediate.</p> <p>19 <b>Q. What else was on that list besides</b></p> <p>20 <b>speaker programs?</b></p> <p>21 A. What do you mean? I don't</p> <p>22 understand the question.</p> <p>23 <b>Q. So my understanding of the risk</b></p> <p>24 <b>assessment list that you were describing, was</b></p> <p>25 <b>that it listed things that the organization had</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p>

## Natalie Nelson-Ling

10/21/2016

Volume I

<p>1 <b>what a speaker program is up to the</b>  2 <b>representatives?</b>  3 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Objection;  4 leading.  5 A. I felt that it did because,  6 philosophically, I believe in set rules.  7 Philosophically, other people, particularly  8 Marty, felt that everyone knows what a place  9 that's conducive to a medical education, you  10 know, medical discussion means.  11 It was a problem with  12 interpretation. And I think that there were  13 some sales reps that are more like me than  14 Marty, and, when I read conducive to a medical  15 discussion, heavens, most of my medical  16 discussions are in 4 by 4 rooms talking to a  17 doctor, like this (indicating), you know.  18 That's certainly not where you want to hold a  19 speaker program, you know.  20 It depends upon the interpretation.  21 I disagreed with many of the sales reps'  22 interpretation.  23 <b>Q. Did you think that many of the</b>  24 <b>sales reps were not complying with the</b>  25 <b>guidelines based on the interpretation they had</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 137</p>	<p>1 <b>Tampa look at anything related to a Dr. [REDACTED] ?</b>  2 A. Yes, it did.  3 <b>Q. What do you know about Dr. [REDACTED] ?</b>  4 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Objection; vague.  5 <b>Q. Strike that. What actions --</b>  6 <b>strike that again. What about Dr. [REDACTED] did</b>  7 <b>your team look at when they did the audit in</b>  8 <b>Tampa?</b>  9 A. We went to a speaker program, had  10 Dr. [REDACTED], a Tampa based, I think  11 cardiologist, a Tampa based physician, who was  12 hired to give a speaker program, promotional  13 program, educational deck presentation to a  14 group of HCPs.  15 We had done some investigations  16 talking to sales reps, talking to the sales rep  17 looking at documents regarding the sales rep  18 that was doing the fishing boat programs. We  19 went to the program that Dr. [REDACTED] was  20 supposed to be speaking at.  21 We got there. They were sitting at  22 a large table in the middle of a restaurant with  23 no SlideDeck, eating maybe their salads, and we  24 fixed it.  25 <b>Q. Well, just so we have something</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 139</p>
<p>1 <b>chosen?</b>  2 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Objection;  3 leading.  4 A. No. I think that the people that  5 interpreted the guideline felt that what they  6 were doing was okay.  7 <b>Q. I'm wondering what you thought of</b>  8 <b>what they were doing, whether it was okay or</b>  9 <b>not?</b>  10 A. I thought that what they were doing  11 was not okay.  12 <b>Q. How many speaker program audits did</b>  13 <b>you or your team do in Tampa, approximately?</b>  14 A. At this time, I do not recall. I  15 know that we looked at the documentation from  16 many programs. I know that we attended the one  17 program. I don't know if we attended other  18 programs, because, if we did, nothing  19 interesting happened.  20 <b>Q. I'm trying to get a sense relative</b>  21 <b>to the 45 that you did in the Q3, approximately</b>  22 <b>how large the Tampa audit was?</b>  23 A. It would have been two to three  24 sales reps, two to three programs, most.  25 <b>Q. Did the audit that your team did in</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 138</p>	<p>1 <b>more specific on the record, can you tell me</b>  2 <b>what you mean by, "we fixed it"?</b>  3 A. We made him go out and get his  4 computer, present the slides. We had been  5 alerted by one of the sales reps that Dr. --  6 that the doctor liked to take an extra meal to  7 go. We -- I monitored the liquor. I didn't let  8 anything get to the table, no matter whether it  9 was ordered or not, and I had David Hollasch sit  10 next to Mrs. [REDACTED] during the program and  11 watch her advance the slides and listen to the  12 presentation.  13 <b>Q. Was Mrs. [REDACTED] a healthcare</b>  14 <b>professional herself?</b>  15 A. She purported to be.  16 <b>Q. Do you know whether she actually</b>  17 <b>was?</b>  18 A. A health -- she may have been.  19 <b>Q. Did anyone check to see whether she</b>  20 <b>was?</b>  21 A. We did.  22 <b>Q. And do you remember whether she was</b>  23 <b>now or --</b>  24 A. A healthcare professional could be  25 somebody that works in the doctor's office. And</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 140</p>

## Natalie Nelson-Ling

10/21/2016

Volume I

<p>1 <b>Anti-Kickback Statute with the scenario that I</b>  2 <b>gave to you, with the spouse who works in the</b>  3 <b>office?</b>  4 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Objection;  5 leading. As if God cares about the  6 Anti-Kickback Statute.  7 A. If the person doesn't get anything  8 out of the educational exchange, then I think an  9 educational exchange hasn't -- hasn't occurred.  10 <b>Q. So is that a yes or a no, with</b>  11 <b>respect to the Anti-Kickback Statute?</b>  12 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Objection to form.  13 A. I think that if they don't get --  14 if they're not capable of getting anything from  15 it, and that would have to be individual, and  16 based upon the individual deck and the  17 individual itself, then I think it has a  18 potential to be an Anti-Kickback.  19 <b>Q. I'm going to mark another exhibit</b>  20 <b>for you. This is going to be Nelson-Ling GX-2.</b>  21 <b>(Nelson-Ling Exhibit GX-2, Document</b>  22 <b>Bates stamped NPCLSV_LIT003486097 through</b>  23 <b>NPCLSV_LIT003486142, marked for identification.)</b>  24 MS. JUDE: And, for the record,  25 this is Bates stamped NPCLSV_LIT003486097</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 145</p>	<p>1 know they are under scrutiny, it is likely that  2 the Thursday dinner will be cancelled or handled  3 outside their norm. What do you recommend we  4 do?"  5 Do you remember what this email is  6 about?  7 A. It's about the [REDACTED] and the mini  8 audit that we did down in Tampa.  9 <b>Q. Then I'm going to direct you to the</b>  10 <b>next page, the one that ends in 6111.</b>  11 So Julie has replied to you, that  12 email is redacted, and then you respond back to  13 her on March 4, 2010:  14 "Julie, David and I discussed the  15 MO for the Tampa work and recommend that we: 1)  16 attend without notice the speaker program on the  17 18th of March (arrive 15 minutes after program  18 start and simply tell Chris Tilberg that he has  19 a surprise audit by E&amp;C) -- fly in and out."  20 Why did you recommend this approach  21 to Julie Kane?  22 A. To avoid having the speaker program  23 be cancelled.  24 <b>Q. And why were you concerned that it</b>  25 <b>would be cancelled?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 147</p>
<p>1 through 6142. It's a very long email chain.  2 The topmost email is dated September 19, 2011.  3 <b>Q. I want to direct you to an email on</b>  4 <b>the page that ends in 6112. It's the little</b>  5 <b>number in the bottom right-hand corner.</b>  6 Do you see the email that says,  7 from Natasha Nelson to Julie Kane, cc'ing three  8 people, subject "Employee Interview Notice Re:  9 Interviews in Tampa"?  10 Tell me when you find that.  11 A. Okay.  12 <b>Q. Are you on the page that ends 6112?</b>  13 A. Yes.  14 <b>Q. I'm going to read the email that</b>  15 <b>I'm referring to into the record. It says --</b>  16 <b>it's from you, right, on March 4, 2010?</b>  17 A. Correct.  18 <b>Q. "Julie, I'd like to review the</b>  19 <b>decision reached yesterday and our marching</b>  20 <b>orders for Tampa. The tactics for dealing with</b>  21 <b>the employees and the notice they'll receive of</b>  22 <b>their interviews on Friday are a concern for me.</b>  23 <b>I recommend that we do not give them more than a</b>  24 <b>night's notice to the employees in Tampa prior</b>  25 <b>to their Friday interviews. If the employees</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 146</p>	<p>1 A. Because people fear internal  2 audit-type events.  3 <b>Q. On that first email I read to you,</b>  4 <b>it says, "If the employees know they're under</b>  5 <b>scrutiny, it is likely the Thursday dinner will</b>  6 <b>be cancelled or handled outside their norm."</b>  7 A. Right.  8 <b>Q. What did you mean by "handled</b>  9 <b>outside their norm"?</b>  10 A. I believe that we had information  11 that they -- this was the same area where the  12 woman sales rep was doing the speaker programs  13 on the fishing boats, and we had, I don't  14 remember if it was notice from a male sales rep  15 that something strange was going on or -- I  16 don't remember how we kind of started to get  17 into this, but, we suspected that Dr. [REDACTED]  18 might not give a presentation.  19 So we didn't want them to have  20 notice because we didn't want them -- we didn't  21 want to fly all the way to Tampa and then get a  22 totally in compliance program, if that's what  23 their -- not what their norm was.  24 <b>Q. Is it a best practice, when doing</b>  25 <b>an audit of a speaker program, to give no</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 148</p>

## Natalie Nelson-Ling

10/21/2016

Volume I

<p>1 for Novartis?</p> <p>2 A. It depends what Novartis knew and</p> <p>3 how they educated. It depends upon more facts.</p> <p>4 <b>Q. Would it violate the Anti-Kickback</b></p> <p>5 <b>Statute for a Novartis employee, for that</b></p> <p>6 <b>employee to pay an honorarium to a physician</b></p> <p>7 <b>speaker if that speaker did not actually deliver</b></p> <p>8 <b>a presentation?</b></p> <p>9 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Objection; lacks</p> <p>10 foundation.</p> <p>11 A. If -- is this going back to what</p> <p>12 you were saying before, to induce the doctor to</p> <p>13 write for Medicaid and Medicare?</p> <p>14 <b>Q. Yes. All my questions in this line</b></p> <p>15 <b>of questioning, please assume that there's a</b></p> <p>16 <b>federal healthcare entity paying.</b></p> <p>17 A. Okay. So the question is, in a</p> <p>18 Medicare -- if a Novartis employee paid a bribe,</p> <p>19 like gave a \$200 gift check to a physician to</p> <p>20 get them to prescribe for a Medicare, Medicaid</p> <p>21 patient a Novartis drug? Yes.</p> <p>22 <b>Q. And if a Novartis employee paid the</b></p> <p>23 <b>speaker an honorarium for an event at which the</b></p> <p>24 <b>speaker did not actually speak, would that</b></p> <p>25 <b>violate the Anti-Kickback Statute?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 193</p>	<p>1 <b>spent most of the time at the event socializing</b></p> <p>2 <b>with the other doctors?</b></p> <p>3 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Objection; lacks</p> <p>4 foundation.</p> <p>5 A. It would depend upon what they</p> <p>6 presented. So, for example, you have to have</p> <p>7 indication, limitations of use, safety, all</p> <p>8 right, you have to talk about the black box</p> <p>9 warning, you have to have some promotional</p> <p>10 content, all right. If they give core</p> <p>11 information, you probably could have a shorter</p> <p>12 speech. I don't know how fast the person's</p> <p>13 talking, I don't know what -- you know, there's</p> <p>14 facts that you'd have to look into.</p> <p>15 But if you're asking is it</p> <p>16 prohibited for, after a legitimate speaker</p> <p>17 program, for people to talk or laugh or network</p> <p>18 with people, I don't think it is.</p> <p>19 <b>Q. That's definitely not what I'm</b></p> <p>20 <b>asking.</b></p> <p>21 A. Oh, okay.</p> <p>22 MR. GRUENSTEIN: It did sound like</p> <p>23 what the question was. Maybe you should read</p> <p>24 the question back.</p> <p>25 MS. JUDE: Yeah, we can read the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 195</p>
<p>1 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Objection. Are we</p> <p>2 assuming that inducement caveat that you had</p> <p>3 before?</p> <p>4 MS. JUDE: No.</p> <p>5 A. Oh, you're not assuming the</p> <p>6 inducement? I thought you were assuming the</p> <p>7 inducement for all the questions.</p> <p>8 <b>Q. I'll start over.</b></p> <p>9 A. I'm sorry, I'm getting a little</p> <p>10 tired.</p> <p>11 <b>Q. We'll take another break soon.</b></p> <p>12 A. Okay.</p> <p>13 <b>Q. Okay. Would a Novartis employee</b></p> <p>14 <b>violate the Anti-Kickback Statute if the</b></p> <p>15 <b>employee paid an honorarium to a speaker for an</b></p> <p>16 <b>event at which the speaker did not give any</b></p> <p>17 <b>presentation?</b></p> <p>18 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Objection; lacks</p> <p>19 foundation.</p> <p>20 A. If they used -- if the -- if the</p> <p>21 reason that they paid the honorarium was to get</p> <p>22 the speaker to write prescriptions for Medicaid</p> <p>23 and Medicare, yes.</p> <p>24 <b>Q. Would your answer be the same if</b></p> <p>25 <b>that speaker delivered an abbreviated speech and</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 194</p>	<p>1 question back.</p> <p>2 A. I didn't answer it. I thought I</p> <p>3 was answering it. I'm sorry, what was it again?</p> <p>4 <b>Q. Let me reframe it. Would it</b></p> <p>5 <b>present an Anti-Kickback Statute concern to you,</b></p> <p>6 <b>as a compliance officer, if a Novartis employee</b></p> <p>7 <b>paid an honorarium to a physician speaker who</b></p> <p>8 <b>delivered a 15-minute long presentation, and</b></p> <p>9 <b>spent the majority of a speaker event</b></p> <p>10 <b>socializing with the other HCPs at the event?</b></p> <p>11 MR. GRUENSTEIN: I'm going to</p> <p>12 object.</p> <p>13 A. It would depend upon the facts, but</p> <p>14 that would be something that I would look into</p> <p>15 to get more facts on. And the facts, as you</p> <p>16 stated it, is enough for a trigger to</p> <p>17 investigate it.</p> <p>18 <b>Q. Is it enough for a trigger to</b></p> <p>19 <b>investigate if the speaker repeatedly speaks to</b></p> <p>20 <b>the same group of doctors on the same drug and</b></p> <p>21 <b>the same topic?</b></p> <p>22 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Objection; lacks</p> <p>23 foundation.</p> <p>24 A. Yes. It -- it would be a trigger</p> <p>25 to investigate. The issue that I had at</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 196</p>

## Natalie Nelson-Ling

10/21/2016

Volume I

<p>1 Novartis is that I didn't know how to figure out 2 who all the attendees were, unless I was there. 3 <b>Q. And --</b> 4 A. So the question you're asking me, I 5 couldn't at that time investigate because I 6 didn't know how or if it was possible within the 7 system for me to pull the attendees. There must 8 have been some way to pull attendees, but it was 9 not something that, in Q3 of 2008, we included 10 on our checklist. 11 <b>Q. If you had been able to pull the</b> 12 <b>names of the attendees at events, what would you</b> 13 <b>have done with those names?</b> 14 A. It would have been something 15 else -- 16 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Objection; calls 17 for speculation. 18 A. It could have been something else 19 that we could have audited. 20 <b>Q. What about the scenario of the same</b> 21 <b>group of doctors attending the same events</b> 22 <b>causes a trigger for an investigation for you?</b> 23 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Objection; calls 24 for speculation. 25 A. Well, again, it's audience fatigue.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 197</p>	<p>1 on audience fatigue or what, at the time, we 2 would have called audience fatigue. 3 <b>Q. At what point does audience fatigue</b> 4 <b>set in?</b> 5 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Objection. 6 A. My rule of thumb, for years, has 7 been two of the same deck per quarter, but I 8 also factor into it that, you know, you can take 9 one deck, but if a lipidologist is giving it 10 versus a cardiologist versus, you know, a 11 pediatric cardiologist is giving it, it gets a 12 different flavor; and so part of it depends upon 13 who the speaker is. 14 <b>Q. If there are three different</b> 15 <b>speakers giving the same deck -- strike that.</b> 16 <b>If there's a different speaker each time --</b> 17 A. Yeah. 18 <b>Q. -- after how many events on the</b> 19 <b>same deck should an attendee stop going?</b> 20 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Objection. Are 21 you asking what she thinks now or what she 22 thought in 2008? 23 <b>Q. I am asking what you think now.</b> 24 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Objection; 25 relevance.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 199</p>
<p>1 But one of the advantages that I have now is 2 that the Government has brought suits in which 3 they've alerted people to this. And so, it 4 wasn't on my checklist back in 2008, but you can 5 bet your bottom dollar it's on my checklist now. 6 You know what I mean? 7 I used to think of it as audience 8 fatigue, but now it's an issue that people look 9 at. So when I look at it from today to try to 10 formulate an answer for what I was thinking 11 about in 2008, I kind of think that it's 12 something I should have looked at, but I didn't 13 even know how to pull that information. It 14 wasn't -- it wasn't included on the checklist. 15 <b>Q. Do you know whether anyone else at</b> 16 <b>Novartis had access to that information at the</b> 17 <b>time that you were there?</b> 18 A. The only person that -- the only 19 kinds of people that would have had access to 20 that would have been people that were in the -- 21 in the Cindy Cetani line, you know. We -- we 22 got information -- we would request information 23 that we wanted. But, in 2008, you know, it 24 sounds stupid now, but we weren't -- we didn't 25 think about, you know, having specific findings</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 198</p>	<p>1 A. What I think now is that two per 2 quarter, eight max per year, and, at more than 3 two per quarter, I would investigate it. At 4 more than -- hopefully, I would start the 5 investigation before it got to eight, but, at 6 eight, I would have some sort of a computer 7 trigger that would trigger that there had been 8 eight. 9 <b>Q. Would you put in any intermediate</b> 10 <b>triggers to alert you to the repeat attendance?</b> 11 A. Two. Two every quarter. 12 <b>Q. And I just asked you about what you</b> 13 <b>think for a limit now.</b> 14 <b>What did you think about for a</b> 15 <b>limit at the time you worked at Novartis?</b> 16 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Objection; lacks 17 foundation. 18 A. I really probably didn't have as 19 defined a view as I do now, but that's based 20 upon the fact that there are -- there are, you 21 know, CIAs out there now that help us figure out 22 what to do, that define what compliance should 23 look like, I didn't have that back in 2008, on 24 the number of times you can attend the same 25 deck. And so, I think that -- what I think I --</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 200</p>

## Natalie Nelson-Ling

10/21/2016

Volume I

<p>1 drop my children off at school, I tended to be, 2 if not the first one, pretty much the first one 3 in the office and the last one back. And so, I 4 had more hours than was maybe typical, so I 5 could handle more investigations. But the 6 volume of investigations we had and the 7 requirement to have a witness to be able to take 8 notes and to -- to, you know, be a neutral 9 listener, required us to have people and have 10 space.</p> <p>11 One of the things that Novartis did 12 which was very accommodating was that, they 13 hired a number of temps, such as Andrew 14 Gallinger, who was a highly intelligent, highly 15 educated person, who came in to be my witness.</p> <p>16 When we had that first real lot of 17 investigations that we had to do to catch up on 18 the Maria Woods, I was able to hire two interns 19 that literally helped, were my witness in 20 investigations, set up the interviews, took the 21 notes, wrote them up as a draft. You know, I 22 think that they gave me a lot of resources.</p> <p>23 Would I have liked to have more? 24 Sure. Maybe I would have left before 7 o'clock 25 at night, you know. Did I get the work done? I</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 221</p>	<p>1 frame.</p> <p>2 My goal always was that, any 3 complaint that came in, we touched it within 4 three days. Sometimes a touch was looking at it 5 and going, oh, come on, you know, this does 6 not -- this is low priority, this is, you know, 7 two people that don't get along, as opposed to 8 some sort of a compliance issue. This is an HR 9 issue as opposed to something else.</p> <p>10 I hope we mostly met our goal. I 11 hope that when we touched issues and read it 12 quickly to triage it that we didn't make 13 mistakes. I can't tell you that we didn't make 14 mistakes. But I can tell you that everybody 15 tried to touch something within three days.</p> <p>16 MS. JUDE: I'm going to mark 17 another exhibit for you, which is Nelson-Ling 18 GX-5.</p> <p>19 (Nelson-Ling Exhibit GX-5, Document 20 Bates stamped NPCLSV_LIT1574840 through 21 NPCLSV_LIT1574843, marked for identification.)</p> <p>22 <b>Q. This is Bates stamped ending in</b> 23 <b>1574840 through 4843, and the top email is from</b> 24 <b>David Hollasch, it's a Novartis email address to</b> 25 <b>his Comcast email address, and he's forwarding</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 223</p>
<p>1 got the work done.</p> <p>2 <b>Q. During the time you were at</b> 3 <b>Novartis, was there ever a time that red flags</b> 4 <b>about a particular event or sales representative</b> 5 <b>were raised, but, due to lack of manpower, you</b> 6 <b>were not able to investigate?</b></p> <p>7 A. If a red flag was raised, I like to 8 think that we got to each one, but we would get 9 through a red flag in three days. So, for 10 example, this Dr. [REDACTED] guy who calls up and 11 goes, I'm calling the FDA, that would be a red 12 flag and you'd call him back right away. Which 13 is one of the reasons that you see, when I wrote 14 this thing up, I called him back at, you know, 15 and it listed the time, to show that, you know, 16 I called the dude back, you know, as quick as 17 possible, and I called him back, apparently, by 18 myself, which shows, you know, how quickly, you 19 know, we responded.</p> <p>20 You know, there were issues which 21 you saw that would be red flags, yellow flags. 22 You know, however, we didn't flag it, but we 23 were -- clearly were not so rigid that, you 24 know, something that looked to be critically 25 important, we didn't look into in a fast time</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 222</p>	<p>1 other emails.</p> <p>2 On the second page, I want to 3 direct you to the email in the middle that's 4 from David Hollasch on February 1, 2010 to you. 5 Do you see that one?</p> <p>6 A. In the middle?</p> <p>7 <b>Q. Yeah, the second page, where it</b> 8 <b>says Natasha --</b></p> <p>9 A. Oh.</p> <p>10 <b>Q. So David writes, "Natasha, the</b> 11 <b>responsibility for speaker infraction follow-up</b> 12 <b>should reside with Marketing or CSO, and I</b> 13 <b>recommend that E&amp;C not get involved even for a</b> 14 <b>short time, as I don't think we budgeted the</b> 15 <b>money to assume this responsibility. I could be</b> 16 <b>wrong, as I was not involved with the budgeting</b> 17 <b>process. Can you send me details on our budget</b> 18 <b>for consultants? Since the budget was cut, I</b> 19 <b>need to start developing an exit plan for Bob,</b> 20 <b>Roberto and/or Rebecca."</b></p> <p>21 Then on the next email, which is on 22 the first page, you write back, "I have nothing 23 on the budget at all. Julie told me that we got 24 the same as 2009. Cindy said we got cut; I 25 asked Cindy for it but got nothing."</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 224</p>

## Natalie Nelson-Ling

10/21/2016

Volume I

<p>1           <b>Do you remember this exchange?</b></p> <p>2           A.    Yes.</p> <p>3           <b>Q.    Do you know what ultimately</b></p> <p>4 <b>happened to the budget?</b></p> <p>5           A.    The budget was cut. This was not</p> <p>6 under Julie Kane. This was when Cindy Cetani</p> <p>7 took over.</p> <p>8           <b>Q.    What was the budget that was cut</b></p> <p>9 <b>for?</b></p> <p>10          A.    It was cut for people to do</p> <p>11 investigations and auditing, and for us to</p> <p>12 have -- it was -- it was all our extra hands --</p> <p>13 many of our extra hands being cut.</p> <p>14          <b>Q.    Did this affect the number of</b></p> <p>15 <b>investigations that Novartis was able to do?</b></p> <p>16          MR. GRUENSTEIN: Objection;</p> <p>17 leading.</p> <p>18          A.    This was at the time period where</p> <p>19 it was clear I was no longer going to be working</p> <p>20 at Novartis, and I can't tell you what happened</p> <p>21 with investigations after I left.</p> <p>22          <b>Q.    When did it become clear to you</b></p> <p>23 <b>that you were going to be leaving Novartis?</b></p> <p>24          A.    In probably 2009.</p> <p>25          <b>Q.    And what prompted that realization</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 225</p>	<p>1           the operating unit level in a number of the</p> <p>2 different operating units. They formed --</p> <p>3 Novartis management formed committees to</p> <p>4 implement the remediation, many committees, that</p> <p>5 met constantly, discussing the same thing</p> <p>6 constantly, and we talked about it constantly.</p> <p>7           Now, Ludwig's get it done</p> <p>8 overnight, it was a year past.</p> <p>9           <b>Q.    I just want to make sure I</b></p> <p>10 <b>understand. So you were focusing that answer on</b></p> <p>11 <b>constantly discussing the same thing. Was there</b></p> <p>12 <b>any action that was being implemented at the</b></p> <p>13 <b>time that these discussions were happening?</b></p> <p>14          A.    Yes. David Hollasch and I actually</p> <p>15 gave this presentation at the operating units.</p> <p>16 We enforced on it, we did ride-alongs on it, we</p> <p>17 -- we worked very hard to bring this</p> <p>18 multidisciplinary remediation through all the</p> <p>19 different functional groups. It was important</p> <p>20 to get the buy-in of legal, of Marty, of Cindy.</p> <p>21 It was many, many meetings, everyone with the</p> <p>22 goal to remediate Q3 2008 issues.</p> <p>23          <b>Q.    Are you familiar with the term</b></p> <p>24 <b>speak-up culture?</b></p> <p>25          A.    Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 227</p>
<p>1           <b>for you?</b></p> <p>2           A.    Mid-2009, Julie told me that I was</p> <p>3 not going to get the chief compliance officer</p> <p>4 position, that it was going to go to another,</p> <p>5 and it was clear at that point that we weren't</p> <p>6 accomplishing as much as one would hope in</p> <p>7 remediating for something on facts that were</p> <p>8 from Q3 2008.</p> <p>9           <b>Q.    How did it become clear to you at</b></p> <p>10 <b>that point that compliance was not accomplishing</b></p> <p>11 <b>as much as you or others had hoped?</b></p> <p>12          A.    We were still giving the same</p> <p>13 speech. We were still giving iterations of</p> <p>14 GX-3.</p> <p>15          <b>Q.    By saying you're still giving</b></p> <p>16 <b>iterations of the same speech, are you saying</b></p> <p>17 <b>that you're not moving forward or are you saying</b></p> <p>18 <b>something else?</b></p> <p>19          A.    I was saying it wasn't moving</p> <p>20 forward.</p> <p>21          <b>Q.    And, what was the status of</b></p> <p>22 <b>remediating the problems that the audit had</b></p> <p>23 <b>uncovered?</b></p> <p>24          A.    We made a number of positive steps.</p> <p>25 David Hollasch and I actually did training on</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 226</p>	<p>1           <b>Q.    What does that mean?</b></p> <p>2           A.    Speak-up culture was -- there were</p> <p>3 a couple of different things that we did to try</p> <p>4 to get the message out, you know, to speak up,</p> <p>5 to file a complaint. And, one of the things</p> <p>6 that we did is, Julie let me spend money to go</p> <p>7 to a vendor who gave us a little, like, Rubik's</p> <p>8 Cube-type thing, it was a toy that you could</p> <p>9 play with, and it advertised speaking up, and it</p> <p>10 advertised the hotline and it talked about doing</p> <p>11 the right thing.</p> <p>12           I don't know if I have any of them</p> <p>13 any more, it's hard to explain, but it could</p> <p>14 open, it could fold, it was a toy, and we got</p> <p>15 thousands of those to be able to hand out to</p> <p>16 people, you know, when they did training, to try</p> <p>17 to impress upon them the importance of speaking</p> <p>18 up if you see that people aren't following the</p> <p>19 remediation training.</p> <p>20          <b>Q.    Did Novartis have a speak-up</b></p> <p>21 <b>culture?</b></p> <p>22          MR. GRUENSTEIN: Objection; vague.</p> <p>23          A.    I don't know.</p> <p>24          <b>Q.    Do you think that the efforts with</b></p> <p>25 <b>the Rubik's Cube to popularize about speaking up</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 228</p>

## Natalie Nelson-Ling

10/21/2016

Volume I

<p>1 going to the speaker program, yes, to learn 2 about Novartis products, but also to ask the 3 question about a kind of patient and to talk -- 4 and the doctor could talk about it. 5 A lot of the discussions that 6 happened afterwards, where there were medical 7 discussions, a lot of times it would be those, 8 or it would be people exchanging, you know, 9 their kind of case experiences. 10 <b>Q. I believe you testified that even 11 when the presentations were 15 minutes, they 12 could still be 15 minutes of education, is that 13 correct?</b> 14 A. They could. 15 MS. JUDE: Objection; misstates 16 testimony. 17 A. Potentially could, yeah. 18 <b>Q. And could that still be valuable to 19 a doctor?</b> 20 MS. JUDE: Objection; calls for 21 speculation. 22 A. It could. 23 <b>Q. You also testified about some work 24 that you did in Tampa, do you recall that?</b> 25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 253</p>	<p>1 A. It was someone from Cravath, and I 2 think her name was Nina Dillon, something like 3 that. 4 <b>Q. Was also WilmerHale involved, 5 that's another law firm?</b> 6 A. I know WilmerHale. I don't 7 recall Wilmer -- I don't recall people other 8 than Cravath. 9 <b>Q. That's the way I like it, that 10 people should only remember Cravath. For good 11 things, though.</b> 12 Did Cravath assist in the 13 investigation? 14 A. As I recall, the answer is yes. 15 <b>Q. By hiring -- strike that. Did you 16 believe that Novartis was taking the allegations 17 about Dr. [REDACTED] seriously?</b> 18 MS. JUDE: Objection. 19 A. I was taking it seriously. 20 <b>Q. What were you doing to show that 21 you were taking it seriously?</b> 22 A. Acting upon it, taking people down 23 to Tampa, more than one person. 24 <b>Q. And what was the outcome of the 25 investigation, if you recall?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 255</p>
<p>1 <b>Q. Was that involving Dr. [REDACTED] ?</b> 2 A. Yes. 3 <b>Q. Now, was that a run-of-the-mill 4 audit or was that an internal investigation?</b> 5 A. It was a combo of the two. 6 <b>Q. Let me ask the question slightly 7 differently. What led you to look into 8 Dr. [REDACTED], if you recall?</b> 9 A. I'm not sure I recall. If you want 10 me to guess, I am guessing. 11 <b>Q. No guessing. Not necessary.</b> 12 A. All right. 13 <b>Q. Unless your lawyer wants you to 14 guess. But I don't want you to guess.</b> 15 A. Okay. 16 <b>Q. Do you recall that there was a 17 letter that was sent to Novartis about 18 Dr. [REDACTED] ?</b> 19 A. No, I don't. 20 <b>Q. Are you aware -- let me strike 21 that. When you looked into -- strike that. 22 When you investigated Dr. [REDACTED], did you do it 23 with an outside counsel?</b> 24 A. Yes. 25 <b>Q. Who was the outside counsel?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 254</p>	<p>1 A. The outcome is that it was turned 2 over to outside counsel. 3 <b>Q. To further investigate, is that 4 correct?</b> 5 A. I do not know. 6 <b>Q. Are you aware that Dr. [REDACTED] was 7 taken off of the speaker list?</b> 8 MS. JUDE: Objection; leading. 9 A. I did not know. 10 <b>Q. Would you be happy to hear that 11 Dr. [REDACTED] was taken off the speaker list?</b> 12 A. I would be. 13 <b>Q. You also talked about New Haven. 14 Was that just -- was that an audit or an 15 investigation?</b> 16 A. It was an audit. 17 <b>Q. And there, I believe you testified, 18 you found no issues?</b> 19 A. I do not recall finding issues. 20 <b>Q. And then either North Carolina or 21 South Carolina, was that an audit or 22 investigation?</b> 23 A. Audit. 24 <b>Q. And again, I believe you testified 25 that you didn't recall finding any issues?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 256</p>

## Natalie Nelson-Ling

10/21/2016

Volume I

<p>1 that -- that you pay the speaker for is the 2 ability to be able to answer questions, so you 3 send the speakers new articles, you send them 4 FAQs, so that they can answer frequently asked 5 questions, and do it in a succinct and logical 6 manner. So I think that there was the intention 7 there. 8 <b>Q. Did anyone at Novartis explain to 9 you, when you were hired, why they wanted to 10 jump start their auditing, monitoring and 11 investigations department?</b> 12 A. Julie explained to me when I was 13 hired that they had a gap in investigations and 14 they hadn't done auditing and monitoring, and we 15 had a successful program at Daiichi Sankyo, and 16 she basically wanted to transplant the 17 department so that the auditing and monitoring 18 system that we created at Daiichi Sankyo could 19 be made Novartis-like. 20 <b>Q. And when you said earlier that you 21 wouldn't have been surprised to learn that 100 22 people were working on implementing the 23 remediation following the 2008 Q3 audit, you 24 don't know whether it was 100 or fewer than 100, 25 right?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 265</p>	<p>1 <b>would have been dedicating the majority of their 2 time to that, correct?</b> 3 A. Correct. Correct. There was no 4 person hired to only do this remediation. 5 <b>Q. There was no employee at Novartis 6 whose full-time job was remediation?</b> 7 A. Correct. 8 MS. JUDE: That's it. 9 THE WITNESS: Okay. 10 MR. GRUENSTEIN: Just make sure 11 that Mr. Glaser doesn't have any clarifying 12 questions. 13 MR. GLASER: I have no questions. 14 Thank you. 15 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This marks the 16 end of tape 5. We are going off the record. 17 The time is 6:43. 18 19 (Whereupon, the deposition 20 concluded at 6:43 p.m.) 21 22 - - - 23 24 25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 267</p>
<p>1 A. I don't know, you know, and I 2 didn't say that they were working on it full 3 time. 4 <b>Q. That was going to be my next 5 question.</b> 6 A. There was a number -- so, for 7 example, in each operating unit, the VP 8 designated a person to be in charge of getting 9 the remediation implemented through the OU, so 10 that person was working on it. 11 People in Cindy Cetani's elongated 12 group, meaning that they worked on speaker 13 programs, things like that, those people worked 14 on the remediation. People in ethics and 15 compliance worked on it. Other, you know, 16 managers were given checklists to work on it. 17 There were a number of different people that 18 were assigned the job to help implement the 19 remediation. 20 <b>Q. So when you were estimating the 21 number of people who might have worked on the 22 remediation, was that estimate the number of 23 people who would have touched on it in some way?</b> 24 A. Yes. 25 <b>Q. And not the number of people who</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 266</p>	<p>1 C E R T I F I C A T E 2 3 STATE OF NEW YORK ) ss. 4 COUNTY OF NEW YORK ) 5 6 I, ROBERTA CAIOLA, a Shorthand Reporter 7 and Notary Public within and for the State of 8 New York, do hereby certify: 9 That NATALIE ELAINE NELSON-LING, the 10 witness whose deposition is hereinbefore set 11 forth, was duly sworn by me and that such 12 deposition is a true record of the testimony 13 given by the witness. 14 I further certify that I am not related to 15 any of the parties to this action by blood or 16 marriage, and that I am in no way interested in 17 the outcome of this matter. 18 In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my 19 hand on this date, October 23, 2016. 20 (SIGNED ELECTRONICALLY) 21 ROBERTA CAIOLA 22 STATE OF NEW YORK 23 (My commission expires April 2018) 24 25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 268</p>